



ISSN 1181-6465

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Third Session, 37th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 29 October 2002

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mardi 29 octobre 2002

**Standing committee on
estimates**

Office of the Premier

**Comité permanent des
budgets des dépenses**

Cabinet du premier ministre

Chair: Gerard Kennedy
Clerk: Trevor Day

Président : Gerard Kennedy
Greffier : Trevor Day

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
3330 Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St W
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation
3330 Édifice Whitney ; 99, rue Wellesley ouest
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400 ; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ESTIMATESCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES
BUDGETS DES DÉPENSES

Tuesday 29 October 2002

Mardi 29 octobre 2002

The committee met at 1538 in room 151.

OFFICE OF THE PREMIER

The Vice-Chair (Mr Alvin Curling): We'll resume the estimates of the Office of the Premier. When we last met, the third party was starting off with 20 minutes.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): Chair, before we actually start, there's a time allocation motion in the House on a bill I've got to speak to. At one point I've got to go out and speak, and I ask for a bit of co-operation. If it works out in rotation, could we just work it out that I'd skip and it would come back to me? Is that OK with you guys?

Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton): Are you going to say something nice when you're up there?

M. Bisson: I didn't know that was a condition. Basically I'm just asking for unanimous consent, whether there is consent of the committee that if it happens on one of my rotations that I have to go, I will just stand down and get my spot after. Agreed?

The Vice-Chair: I hear unanimous consent, an agreement.—

Mr Bisson: Thank you very much. On avait débuté la semaine passée dans nos questions. La question que je vous ai posée—quand la décision avait été prise par le bureau du premier ministre et, supposément, par le premier ministre lui-même sur la question de la conférence à Beyrouth, on a refusé à M. Baird, le ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones, l'occasion d'aller représenter la communauté francophone à Beyrouth. Je vous ai demandé la semaine passée de me donner une réponse : pour quelle raison le premier ministre lui-même a refusé l'accord M. Baird aller représenter la communauté à Beyrouth. Avez-vous une réponse ?

Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe): On a point of order, Mr Chair: I think we have the wrong ministry. It's the minister responsible for francophone affairs that this question is directed to.

The Vice-Chair: I think the question is appropriate.

M. Bisson: Si vous écoutez la traduction, vous allez voir que c'est une décision du premier ministre. Avez-vous compris ? Oui ?

Mr Mazzilli: Yes.

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): I don't have any of the background on that particular tour or schedule. I was under the impression that Mr Lalonde was the representative not of the government but of the province

of Ontario and he was selected through a committee to attend a conference in Beirut. My understanding was that a committee nominated Mr Jean-Marc Lalonde. I don't have anything beyond that.

M. Bisson: Non. J'essaie d'expliquer. Je reprends la question une autre fois, puis vous êtes capable d'amener une réponse demain. Tout ce que je veux avoir, c'est une réponse.

Le Sommet de la francophonie est un sommet des chefs d'État des pays francophones du monde. Cela veut dire la France, le Canada et d'autres pays francophones qui sont représentés au sommet de Beyrouth. C'est un sommet pour les chefs d'État. En d'autres mots, c'est les membres du gouvernement. Ce n'est pas les membres de l'opposition qui d'habitude fréquentent cette réunion. C'est les chefs d'États eux-mêmes. Justement, M. Lord, le premier ministre du Nouveau-Brunswick, y était de la part du Nouveau-Brunswick comme chef d'État, M. Chrétien y était comme le chef d'État du Canada, et nous, l'Ontario, notre premier ministre n'a pas été capable d'y aller. On a avait demandé la permission de M. Baird d'y aller à sa place.

Ma question est bien simple. Ce n'est pas un comité qui décide ça. C'est un sommet des chefs d'État. Tout ce que je veux savoir : pour quelle raison le premier ministre a-t-il refusé à M. Baird d'aller représenter la province de l'Ontario à ce sommet ?

Mr Dunlop: Our understanding is that the Premier did not refuse to attend that conference or summit. It was really a matter of availability. Minister Baird, it's my understanding, was not available to attend that particular summit.

M. Bisson: En d'autres mots, on ne m'a pas donné de réponse. Mais laissez-moi au moins essayer de faire ce point-ci.

Interjections.

M. Bisson: Non, je connais la réponse. Le point, c'est que c'est une réunion de chefs d'État. Au mois d'août l'année passée, j'ai demandé directement à M. Baird si lui voulait aller nous représenter parce que nous, les partis de l'opposition, supporterions sa nomination d'aller à la place du premier ministre, parce qu'on a compris que le premier ministre ne pouvait pas aller. On a accepté ça. Tout ce qu'on a demandé, c'est qu'un autre ministre y aille. Ce qui est arrivé à la fin, c'est que M. Eves a refusé l'occasion pour M. Baird d'y aller.

À ce point-ci vous m'avez donné une réponse et je ne suis pas satisfait, mais quand même je veux faire le point

que pour la francophonie de l'Ontario, le Sommet de la francophonie est important, parce que c'est une occasion que l'on a pour être capable d'établir des connexions avec d'autres pays francophones du monde, non seulement pour des raisons politiques dans le sens d'avancer la démocratie dans les autres parties du monde, mais plus important pour nous ici, pour être capables d'établir des liens culturels et économiques qui peuvent se donner à ce sommet à travers ce processus. Un problème que l'on a, c'est que l'Ontario est là seulement comme observateur, et nous demandons que la province de l'Ontario fasse une demande pour être admise comme membre entier de la francophonie.

La deuxième partie de ma question : est-ce que le premier ministre de l'Ontario et son bureau sont d'accord pour application que la province de l'Ontario fasse une demande officielle pour devenir membre entier du Sommet de la francophonie ?

Mr Dunlop: The government of Ontario understands the importance of this event. As I said earlier, Mr Baird was not available to attend that conference. I really would have to get into more details on his schedule at a later date.

M. Bisson: Ce n'est pas la question que j'ai posée. Ma question est qu'il y a deux manières que l'on peut assister au Sommet de la francophonie. On peut y aller comme membre, reconnu par le Sommet de la francophonie, ou on peut y aller comme observateur. La province de l'Ontario a besoin de faire une demande pour devenir membre entier du sommet. Ma question est très simple : est-ce que le bureau du premier ministre est d'accord pour que la province fasse une demande au Sommet de la francophonie pour devenir membre entier de cette organisation, oui ou non ?

Mr Dunlop: This is a question that the minister of francophone affairs will have to answer for you. I cannot commit the Premier's office or the minister's office at this time to answer that question.

M. Bisson: Mon problème, c'est que c'est une décision du premier ministre. Tout ce que je demande c'est, quand vous partez, et revenez pour demain, de vérifier avec le bureau du premier ministre s'ils sont préparés à faire une demande pour devenir membres de la francophonie, de demander auprès du bureau et nous en faire part demain. Ce n'est pas une décision de M. Baird; c'est une décision pour le premier ministre.

Mr Dunlop: Quite simply, I felt it was primarily the minister of francophone affairs' decision. He deals with francophone affairs, not only in Ontario but in Ontario's role across the world. I can't guarantee I'll have that answer for you tomorrow. I'll try to find out everything I can on it.

M. Bisson: OK, vous allez essayer d'avoir une réponse. C'est tout ce que je demande.

Deuxième partie : la question fait affaire avec la Loi 8 elle-même. Vous êtes au courant de la Loi 8? Savez-vous ce que c'est, la Loi 8, la Loi sur les services en français?

Mr Dunlop: I know a little about the bill. I'll try to answer—

M. Bisson: Juste pour expliquer, la Loi 8 dit simplement que dans les régions désignées où il y a un nombre suffisant de francophones, la province de l'Ontario va desservir la communauté francophone en français pour les services que la province donne elle-même. En d'autres mots, si tu demeures à Timmins, à Toronto, à Ottawa, dans les places qui sont désignées, dans ce cas-là, ce qui arrive c'est que n'importe quel service offert par la province doit être offert en français.

Ce qui est arrivé c'est que votre gouvernement, il y a environ quatre ou cinq ans, a délaissé certains services, qui étaient des services provinciaux, aux municipalités. En d'autres mots, par exemple, certaines contraventions étaient transférées des cours provinciales aux municipalités; d'autres services du bord du bien-être social et autres ont été transférés directement aux municipalités. Ma question est seulement : est-ce que le bureau du premier ministre a fait une étude de surveillance des services qui ont été transférés pour déterminer si des services sont encore donnés en français, tels que ceux donnés en français quand la province elle-même avait ces responsabilités?

Mr Dunlop: First of all, in response, it's a question for which we will try to obtain the exact information for you. But I want to comment on the fact that where I come from, the riding of Simcoe North has a very strong French community in the region of Penetanguishene, Lafontaine, Perkinsfield, and many of the services are provided: radio stations, newspapers. We're quite proud of the heritage and the culture that surrounds the French communities in that part of the province, as you are of course in northern Ontario, and particularly in the Ottawa area as well.

As I said earlier, I don't know all the details of Bill 8. I will try to obtain more information for you. However, most of the information I see in my riding—since our government came to power, we have restructured the school boards and now we're fortunate enough to have two French-language school boards in that part of the province and they're working very well. I meet with them on a regular basis. In fact, I'm trying to make some arrangements for some property purchases through one of the school boards for another organization that would like to buy an old school that is owned by one of the French boards.

As I said earlier, I'll try to obtain that information. I appreciate the comments because I come from a strong French community and know the importance of that heritage to those people.

M. Bisson: Pour que vous compreniez la question, l'information que je veux savoir, c'est : est-ce que le bureau du premier ministre ou un autre ministère sous le premier ministre a fait des études pour déterminer que, quand les services ont été transférés de la province aux municipalités, en effet les services ont été respectés quant ça vient à donner ces services en français?

Mr Dunlop: I wish I could speak French in this particular case. I'm not sure of any study that has been carried out by the Premier's office, but I will try to obtain that information for you.

1550

Mr Bisson: OK. Just in English now—how much time do I have left?

The Vice-Chair: About seven and a half minutes or so.

Mr Bisson: Seven and a half minutes, my Lord. OK.

Last week, when we got together, we talked about the decision by the Premier's office to effectively start negotiations between CN and Ontario Northland in regard to the transfer or the sale or the privatization, whichever way you want to see it, to CN for the Ontario Northland services.

At that particular time, I was telling you there was some discussion in the community of northern Ontario, just sort of the chattering classes, that there had been a direction by the Premier that in the event of a transfer of services from Ontario Northland to CN, there would be no job losses. In fact, you confirmed that was a direction of the Premier, and I commend him for that. That's a good thing at least. I don't believe you should transfer to CN, but at least there should be some assurances when it comes to job losses.

One of the things that was raised with me after as a result of that was CN's position in regard to the leadership race of the present Premier during the Tory leadership race. Are you aware that CN gave sizable contributions to the Ernie Eves campaign?

Mr Dunlop: Mr Chairman—

Mr Mazzilli: Point of order.

Mr Bisson: Don't worry, I'm not going to get too nasty, Frank. Just relax.

Mr Mazzilli: We're dealing with the Premier's office's estimates. If we could stay on that, I think it would help the committee follow.

The Vice-Chair: The parliamentary assistant seemed willing to respond to the question. But I would say of course in respect of your experience that you'll keep it consistent with the estimates of the Premier's office.

Mr Dunlop: I do not have any information in front of me on any type of donations and what organization provided funding to any leadership campaign or any political party. In any political jurisdiction, whether it's federal, provincial or municipal, I know that a number of organizations donate to all political parties at all different levels of government.

I'm not familiar with any of the dates and I certainly don't have that information.

Mr Bisson: In this particular case, just to be clear here on how it's related, it's my understanding from the research we've done that CN made a contribution of some \$10,000 to the Ernie Eves campaign. Fair enough.

What I want to know is what kind of assurances we have that the consideration that the Premier is going to be taking in regard to the possible sale of assets of Ontario Northland to the CN—to what extent that donation has any kind of influence on the decision to be made, because at this point your government has rejected any consideration for what was the internal solution group plan, which was basically an employee ownership bid that was

being put forward. In fact, that has been rejected and now all of our horses are tied to CN.

My question is very simply this: to what extent do we have assurances that the decision that will ultimately be made by the Premier's office and by the rest of his government is not going to be influenced by that \$10,000?

Mr Dunlop: Again as I said, political contributions come in different sizes from different organizations from all across our province. They certainly will contribute to any leadership campaign. In fact, any candidate in that leadership campaign may or may not have received donations from this particular company.

I have no assurances. I know the Premier is expecting any proposal that's put forth to be the best for that particular community and organization so that we can in fact have job creation in a great organization or company that operates something like Ontario Northland.

Mr Bisson: What I'm trying to get a handle on is, what kind of checks and balances do we have at the Premier's office? In fairness to the government side, everybody's going to contribute to a leadership campaign or to a political party. All parties accept political donations. That's not my argument. I understand that happens. What I want to be clear on is that that money then is not seen as being beholden to any decision that the Premier's office, or any other minister of the crown, would make on behalf of that company that has given a donation. So my simple question is, what kind of assurances do we have, and what kind of steps has the Premier's office taken to make sure there isn't a conflict of interest set up when it comes to those decisions?

The Vice-Chair: Mr Bisson, I've been very lenient about your line of questioning. I think this kind of line of questioning is really not a part of the estimates. I hear you about the checks and balances, but let's be careful as we go along asking those other questions, because it has no relevance to the estimates process itself. I hear where you want to go, but somehow—

Mr Mazzilli: It's the wrong committee.

Mr Bisson: Then I will ask Mr Mazzilli what is the right committee.

Mr Mazzilli: Question period, of course. We're dealing with the estimates.

Mr Dunlop: I think it's fair to say, through you to Mr Bisson, that we all try our very best efforts to abide by the rules of the Integrity Commissioner and what is fair and good for all citizens of the province of Ontario.

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): Unlike Chrétien.

Mr Bisson: Well, I probably would agree with Mr O'Toole on that one. But, Chair, I'm just looking for a little bit of guidance from you here, because part of what the estimates are about is, yes, the expenditures of the Premier's office, but also basically the decisions that are made by his office. As we do at the environment estimates or any other estimates, policy issues are raised there and are perfectly in order.

I'm not arguing with the \$10,000 donation. I accept that that was given and I have to believe it was given in good faith, and I have to believe whatever ensued out of

that is what any other political party would do. That's not my argument. My question to the parliamentary assistant is, what checks and balances are we putting in place in order to make sure that the money that is contributed on behalf of a corporation to either the party or somebody's leadership race is not in some way seen as buying influence when it comes to the decision-making process? What policies has the Premier's office put in place to ensure that those lobbyists who are lobbying on behalf of those corporations aren't stepping outside of the bounds of the legislation that's presently in place, that we have to follow?

I thought it was perfectly in order.

Mr Dunlop: We like to think that the government is held accountable by the citizens who elect us to this position and the rules that we follow under the Office of the Integrity Commissioner.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair: Is that your time?

Mr Bisson: Yes. I must be about at the end of it.

The Vice-Chair: Now the questioning goes to the government side: 20 minutes.

Mr O'Toole: We'll try to make very efficient use of the time. I think if I was to define seven years of what this government has tried to achieve, it is the best quality of service, at the best price to the taxpayer. That's a broad description, and I guess the words that describe that the best for me, and I hope for my constituents and the people of Ontario, are openness, accountability, and transparency in process.

Naturally, this could never be achieved by the government itself without the hard work and dedication of a very professional public service, and more importantly and more specifically through the Cabinet Office, Tony Dean and others, who represent the translation of—

Mr Bisson: Isn't this out of order, Frank?

Mr O'Toole: Well, it is. Ultimately, the leadership of this great province comes under the leadership of Premier Ernie Eves—

Mr Bisson: Come on, Frank. Tell him he's out of order.

Mr O'Toole: —working in partnership with the Cabinet Office. The point I am making is that to achieve this level of performance through the public service—and I think it's important to recognize that it has not gone unnoticed, not just within this government but arguably throughout the world, as setting a very high standard of quality, excellence and innovation. I just think it's important to put that on the record.

I'd have to recognize right from the very beginning Art Daniels, the assistant deputy minister of the Ontario public service, who has been very much involved in driving this agenda in excellence and innovation out of the Cabinet Office. If it would be possible to get a presentation on that which would help all the members and the people of Ontario understand that, I would very much appreciate it.

Mr Dunlop: Well, it just so happens we have Art Daniels present today, and he might be able to make a presentation.

Mr O'Toole: I knew it was time. I knew the time had come for—

Mr Bisson: I'm just wondering, Mr Chair, if that's in order. What does that have to do with the estimates?

Mr Mazzilli: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I certainly think that what the government is trying to do on this—either through incompetence or laziness, somehow someone chose the Office of the Premier, where in fact we found the Cabinet Office does most of the approvals. So out of goodwill, we're going to get a presentation on how government works so that perhaps next time people will choose the right ministries that they want before them.

1600

The Vice-Chair: Let me understand this. There is a presentation coming up about the Cabinet Office. Is that it?

Mr Dunlop: It's more on the Ontario public service—

The Vice-Chair: One thing, Mr Parliamentary Assistant. You made a presentation here outlining the office and I asked that it be tabled. I haven't received any of that. I hope I can receive that. It's when you started off.

Mr Dunlop: We have copies.

The Vice-Chair: I hope I get a copy of that presentation you had, and the other thing is that we're going to get a presentation about the Cabinet Office. Is that it?

Mr Dunlop: The intent this afternoon was to try to show you the value of some of the—as we said earlier, the Cabinet Office is actually the Premier's ministry, and any decisions—

The Vice-Chair: You don't have to convince me about the goodness of it. I just want to know, what am I getting here? Am I getting a presentation on the Cabinet Office?

Mr Dunlop: And the Ontario public service.

Mr Bisson: On a quick point of order, Mr Chair: I understood Mr Mazzilli to say that we had to confine ourselves to the expenditures of the Premier's office, but if he wants to expand the scope of these estimates, I'm all for it. We're going to allow it to happen—tit for tat, not a problem.

Mr Dunlop: I think it's fair to say that I've tried to cover as much of the Premier's office as possible.

Mr Bisson: Not a problem. Then we can talk about the Cabinet Office.

Mr Dunlop: I think this would be a fair presentation. I think it would be a valuable presentation to everyone here.

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London): On a point of order, Mr Chair: If we are getting into the Cabinet Office, I would love an explanation of the 35 individuals who are listed on the September 17 Cabinet Office staff who are listed as Premier's staff. Maybe that will be explained in this process.

The Vice-Chair: That's not a point of order. I think we went through that. Could we then have the presentation? How long is this presentation?

Mr Art Daniels: Whatever is left.

Mr Dunlop: We could run into more of the government time as well.

The Vice-Chair: Let's proceed.

Mr Dunlop: Just before Mr Daniels starts—this is Art Daniels, the deputy minister—I would like the opportunity to say that if Mr Daniels needs extra time we could use the government's time in the later part of the rotation. You might find it that interesting that you want—

The Vice-Chair: Let me explain this. The government has 20 minutes. You can use it any way you want. When the 20 minutes is up, it's up to the third party whether they want to give him some of their time. I have been doing the rotation according to the proceedings. The quicker we start and the more they get on, the more we can start explaining what this is all about. So could we proceed?

Mr Dunlop: Yes, Mr Chair. I'm just saying, though, it may go into the second 20 minutes later on in the rotation today.

The Vice-Chair: That's fine with me if they want to do it when they come around.

Mr Dunlop: Yes, thank you.

Mr Daniels: First of all, I brought the award along. This is an award that the Ontario public service won about a month ago in Glasgow, Scotland. Over 150 other organizations across the Commonwealth of Nations—we were competing with our colleagues in the United Kingdom and the government projects of the UK, competing against the Australians and the Australian provinces, against Malaysia, Singapore, India, various islands of the West Indies that are part of the Commonwealth, South Africa, a lot of African nations.

There were 150 organizations, public services, that submitted projects from their organizations, and Ontario prevailed over the 150 not just the first time, but this is our second time. We first won it in 1998 and were able to win again. It's a biennial award, presented by the Commonwealth secretariat every two years. I thought when we won in 1998 it was very exciting, but to win again, with more innovation on top of what we've already accomplished, made us feel very proud.

The silver medallists were from Australia; the bronze medallist was from India. It's quite an international and world event. The Canadian federal public service was also a finalist, but not a medallist. So I think that has great pride for our province.

The cabinet secretary from the United Kingdom, as our hosts, didn't even make the top 10. They were sort of jokingly complaining that here they hosted the thing and they can't make the top 10.

I think as former parts of the British Commonwealth, it's always good when the former colonial group does well over its principal group originally.

The reason this year that we were successful in winning the award was for the idea of linking up government. What's happening now with things like technology, policy clustering etc, is that governments are creating less ministry structure and more cross-ministry

programs because the public is demanding us to link up government differently.

The Australians use the word "link-up"; the British use the word "joined-up" government; in South Africa they call it one-stop-shops; in Canada sometimes you hear about integrated services and collaborative, clustered, single windows.

But we chose to call ours "connected." "Connected" is a great use of a word here because we can connect to our citizens, the people of Ontario, we can connect to each other across the Ontario public service and we can connect electronically. So the word "connection" has a human and an electronic variant.

I've been in government—this is my 37th year as a public servant—and with all sorts of early retirement programs I keep going because I love the work. Serving the province of Ontario, working as a public servant and then actually helping Ontario be successful worldwide is really important.

As a long-time public servant, getting ministries to work together is a tough thing. They have their departmental cultures.

Mr Peters: Silos.

Mr Daniels: Silos. Stovepipes. There are lots of good words, but that's what it is—structures and then turf protection. People are afraid of losing power if they work together—and lack of trust. Sometimes it's about authority to do that, and the skills. But we have to connect. When we work together you get better results. More importantly, the work that Tony Dean does and our colleagues in policy—things are interdependent. If we make a decision in one ministry to crack down on something in the policing or social area, it could affect the corrections. We're part of the larger system that's interdependent.

Technology in the last few years is the latest to start to create more integrated services—I'm going to show you that. And the most important reason to integrate government is that this what the public wants. Over the last several years, in partnership with the federal government, public services—we call ourselves the Citizen Centred Network—have been going out and serving Canadians about public services, not about the political party government but the delivery part: do you want services over the Internet? Do you want services walking in? How would you like those services delivered and what are the ways that would satisfy you? Is it about time? Is it about courtesy? These are all the questions that we've asked.

We also follow how they use the various service channels, in terms of over-the-counter service, Internet, telephone, again measuring the effectiveness of public service. Every province in Canada, all the territories, the federal government and most of the major cities participate in this.

Every two years we go out and build a database, and it really tells us that the public wants government to be faster, simpler—Mr O'Toole left the room, but the Red Tape Commission—that's the number one thing people want, is they want us to simplify the government,

simplify the process. Another very important one is they want us to put it together differently; they want it to be seamless.

One of our earliest initiatives: people told us they didn't know where to start. Most people when they come to government try to look to the phone book. This was the phone book in Ontario in 1999. The federal government had a set of blue pages, the municipality had a set of blue pages and the province had a set of blue pages. That was a problem because most people don't differentiate when they're thinking about service. What was really wrong with these blue pages is they were organized around who we are, not what we do.

So here you would see a blue page with Management Board Secretariat, which has very little public connection yet it would appear in the blue pages. You don't see something like what we just did: birth certificate, health card, driver's licence, fishing licence—begin to talk to people about products. Ontario is the first province in Canada to work with the cities across the province and the federal government to create an integrated Blue Pages that's not about who we are but what we do.

1610

So when somebody comes to you and says, "I can't find the swimming pools any more," they're under "swimming pools." Mr Dunlop was telling me a story about one of his constituents who was looking all over for the provincial park; it just happens to be under "parks."

We start to talk about plain language and services. Other governments, by the way, have asked us for help in this area. In Johannesburg, for instance, if you went to look at the phone book there it would be like our old phone book; if you went to New Delhi it would look like this. I was recently teaching a Commonwealth course, and the people in Barbados just took the Toronto phone book and recreated it just like that. It's such a simple thing, but most public services around the world have not figured it out.

The thing is, when we are innovating in governance and creating this more connected organization, these are the areas we want to connect: we want to connect policies, because policies are interdependent; we want to design our programs in a more connected way; we want to deliver services around people's life events; we want to integrate infrastructure and compliance. I'm going to talk to you about the integrated compliance project and support services.

These are examples of our connected government that deal with more than one ministry and more than one level of government. Teranet is a land company that integrates the parcel maps with planometric maps, with tax maps; in other words, mapping Ontario by parcel and connecting it together, or connecting it as we have. I'm going to demo this in a second.

This is a hand-held computer, very small, for inspectors to help each other. When an aggregate inspector is on a work site they can tip off the labour inspector, again integrating services for higher compliance and creating an integrated inspection and enforcement.

There's community care access centres for seniors. Here's the Shared Services Bureau, where we integrated 20 business functions of the OPS into one and saved \$300 million a year in reduced costs related to support: human resources, finance, purchasing etc. Ontario Business Connects is one of our most successful projects, where we built a single window with all the other governments so that business licences from the province of Ontario, the federal government and the cities are all integrated. When I started this project in 1995 it was 16 weeks to start a business. Now you can start a business on-line in Ontario and get all the licences at the same time in less than 20 minutes. It's a different way of dealing with business.

Service Ontario is connecting individuals. Policy clusters is what Tony has been leading—Tony Dean, who is with us. We have clustered the public service in interdependent groups because they have common customers, common stakeholders, but most importantly, they are part of a service system. Tony's group created and begins to create not just the silos you talked about—every ministry having its own policy unit—but understanding the policy as a community. Then the skills and the policy are interchangeable, so they can have common tool kits and can learn together, take training together, or they can build networks to share best practices.

The inspection, when the virtual inspectorate—the work we've done with studies on the needs of businesses. A lot of you are small businessmen. These are the people, the CFIB etc, who tell us, "We don't mind complying, but why, one day, would a health inspector come and then a labour inspector and then a mining inspector etc without integrating their work and sharing the information? We don't mind complying, but you're adding a burden to us."

The research in this area tells us that we have 5,000 inspectors in the Ontario public service; that's almost 10% of our workforce who work in this area. They are distributed across 13 ministries and their workload overlaps 80%. In other words, they are doing the same thing 80% of the time. Yes, there is a specialty and we don't want to lose that, but 80% of their work is overlap. More importantly for us, 80% of their customers are the same. If the customers overlap and the job overlaps, we have an opportunity to use technology to bring them together.

So across the OPS we have a common risk management tool that helps each of the ministries speak the same language; a common code of professional conduct so that when an inspector goes people can expect the same level of professionalism, the same standards, the same codes; a common learning and training program at the University of Guelph. They're taking distance learning, but they also take courses together and start to see themselves as a community of inspection, investigation and enforcement. It allows us to coordinate for high-risk and use this technology, this little hand-held; you turn it on and there's a common checklist for all inspectors. As you can see on the next slide, this is a workplace health and safety inspector. He's looking for things like hard hats and—

Mr Peters: Where's his hard hat?

Mr Chudleigh: Good point.

Mr Daniels: Good point. That's the first time somebody has said that.

As you can see, one of the questions on the checklists—if you look very carefully, the trees are falling in the pit. He would be normally only be looking for labour things. Now, on this common checklist—it's not hard to figure out that these trees are falling into the aggregate pit and therefore they may be cutting too close to the treeline. This would be in violation of the pits and aggregates legislation.

By sharing this data—the inspectors all share data—they can now target high-risk businesses versus low-risk. If nothing's wrong in one area, it's likely to be compliant in another. If it's wrong in one area, there's a chance that they can deal with their compliance differently.

Now we move to shared services. In the private sector, companies use shared services all the time, but in the public sector Ontario is the leader in changing how it provides human resources, finance, purchasing. In the past we were a bunch of silos, but now we are a bureau with a common payroll system, common finance and purchasing, mail and print, generic training, forms management, fleet management. As I said, by bringing this together we save \$300 million per annum.

But it's not centralizing government, because every ministry has a stake in the Shared Services Bureau through a contract, a service level agreement. Ontario's Shared Services Bureau is huge, double the transaction volumes of General Motors Canada in terms of payments, a public sector payroll that's second only to the federal government, a procurement span of \$3 billion and 20 different lines of business.

This is what it looks like for every individual employee: it's personalized on their laptop. In the past you would have to go to your HR person to find out how much vacation's left, or "What are my benefits?" or "What kind of dental care am I getting?" Now it is personalized to you without a lot of paperwork. It brings it together.

We have created a ministry of Consumer and Business Services to bring the critical mass of transactional services together. We understand that permits, licensing, over-the-counter publications, law, telephone contact centres, land information, public access terminals, kiosks, Internet gateways can be put together in a more clustered and better way for the citizen.

Here is one of our great practices: our government information centres, where we integrate service delivery, where Ontarians can have free access to Internet services for government if they don't have it at home. A lot of our services are transacted that way.

Every government form is available electronically; government programs; you can start a business at each of these sites; Ontario Business Connects is there; telephone directories; and a chance to schedule employment.

We've created a partnership with the federal government, such as this one, to create single windows for

business on the phone. In fact, this is very exciting. You can phone the Canada-Ontario Business Service Centre and, with your permission, they can actually take charge of your browser and help you flip through all the licensing. So you're on the phone, you're on the computer, and you're getting your business started not in 16 weeks—oh, you're going to cut me off, Mr Curling?

The Vice-Chair: I gave you two minutes over.

Mr O'Toole: Mr Chair, on a point of order: I seek unanimous consent to just allow them to finish their presentation and we'll just extend the time around.

Mr Peters: That's fine. I'd just as soon. Why break it up? I agree.

The Vice-Chair: How much more time do we have?

Mr Daniels: I would think three or four minutes.

Mr Dunlop: If we have unanimous consent—thank you.

The Vice-Chair: OK. We'll just subtract it from your time.

1620

Mr Daniels: This has been a very successful program of creating what you saw in that research about being fast, simple and speedy. This is a touch-screen technology.

A million people in Ontario use the kiosks every year. They're open seven days a week, 24 hours a day. You'll notice they deal with change of address for fishing, hunting, health cards. They deal with fine payments at the municipal level, vehicle abstracts, stickers, outdoor cards, all on one thing—seamless government, three minutes. A million people use it. Last year they rated the service at 97%—enormous—and everybody is surveyed. The question we ask at the end of it is, "Did you enjoy the experience?" You've just paid parking tickets, you've bought a driver's licence, and you're saying, "I enjoyed the experience." So it shows that people want these kinds of services.

Here's our gateway to government. Around the world, governments are building these new gateways in plain language, just like the phone book. It's about driving, going to school, life events. Some of our life events are in clustering government around getting married, moving, dealing with somebody who has passed away, spousal abuse, losing your wallet. I put this in for Mr Bisson. He's not here, but it's en français-en anglais. The lost—

Mr Peters: Alternative formats as well?

Mr Daniels: Yes. You can see that it's federal and provincial services. When you lose your wallet, you can begin building your birth certificate, your driver's licence, your health card, your outdoor card, your federal social security, your immigration card. All of these things you can at least start from one site.

Here's one that I think is the most sensitive of all. I think a lot of you are in contact with constituents all the time. They have a death in their family. There's just so much to do if you're an executor. This actually lets you tell the bank to cancel the card, tell the motor vehicle department that that person isn't driving any more, stop the pensions. See all the things it does? Pensions and

benefits, income tax, credit cards, government cards, vehicles, property, clubs and organizations and professional associations. Down here at the bottom, if you've lost a child, it hot-links you to Bereaved Families of Ontario. Up here, if you're looking for the right kind of funeral home, it's the Board of Funeral Services, which will give you a rating on funeral homes in terms of best practices, all on our site, understanding that there's not one part of government or one part of the private sector that deals with the loss of a loved one; it's the whole integrated.

Our publications, our electronic law services, our land information, our Ontario business services are on-line.

Here's a concept that Ontario again leads the world in: there is no wrong door to start a business in Ontario. If you go to the chamber of commerce, they're empowered to start your business. If you go to the federal revenue agency, they'll start your Ontario business. If you go to the city of Toronto's enterprise centre, they'll start your Ontario business. If you go to the Internet, it'll start your Ontario business. In other words, wherever you go is the right place. The government is there to provide you with the service so that you don't have to shop around. The system is welcoming you. As I said, it used to take 16 weeks to start a business in Ontario. We have it down to 20 minutes.

Mr O'Toole: You should make it 16.

Mr Daniels: Yes, get it down to 16. If you get one or two licences, I probably could.

As a result of all this, and I'm coming near the end, this is what experts have said, and this is a study done in Germany by the Bertelsmann Foundation. They looked at FirstGov in the US, UK Online, eCitizen in Singapore, all the leading Web sites. Fairfax, Virginia, Seattle, Washington—and Ontario is at the very top of its game. Ontario can claim to be a world leader in the evolution of e-democracy. It's pretty amazing stuff that we're being benchmarked halfway around the world because of what I just showed you. We step outside our own public service. We step outside our own ministries. We partner with the federal government, municipalities, the not-for-profit and the private to deliver an integrated thing, and that's why the Bertelsmann group in Germany put us at the top.

Infotech Canada congratulated us on our Shared Services Bureau. It rightly says we're a world leader in this area. Three professors, one from Brock University, one from the Rotman school of business and one from Queen's, in a recent book on public management across the world said Ontario has become a North American pioneer in service innovation.

A couple of weeks ago, in the June report of the Ombudsman, Clare Lewis for the first time said that his workload is going down. He's having fewer complaints about government. He put this in his report and immediately got invited to Taiwan to talk not about the number of complaints, about corrections but why, as an ombudsman, his workload is going down. What's driving this less work? It's good services with standards that are measurable.

As I say, we measure all the users of the kiosks, a million of them; 94% enjoy the experience. The question is, "Did you enjoy the experience?" That's the question. Some 2.3 million use the new integrated over-the-counter services, the GICs, rating in at 95%. Ontario Business Connects says, "No wrong door to business." There are 300,000 small businesses that come into life and they use the system.

Then of course our inspectors, the people who are using this new technology, are trained with common compliance tools and a common code of conduct. In a survey done by the Ministry of Labour, 88% of their customers rate the inspectors and investigation staff as fair and equitable. I think that's a good testimony to compliance and service.

All around the world governments are coming to Ontario and we share our stuff. We have partnership agreements with the provinces in South Africa to help them build a new democracy and their new public services. We work with the Jamaican public service to reform their customs and immigration, to reform their land information. We work all around the world. A few weeks ago the government of Seychelles adopted our service standards. It makes you feel good about what we have here in Ontario.

My job is to share Ontario's story. It's a great job, by the way, because I get to talk about our public services and the things we've accomplished over the years, with 130 nations since I took this job in 1997. Countries like China are here every week, different parts of the Chinese public service, rebuilding their public services. I can only count China once, even though they spend lots of time coming to us.

What it does for Ontario is it creates a new kind of government. We have ministries, but now we're integrated around policy, we're integrated around compliance and inspections, we're integrated around support, we're integrated around services to business and individuals. In other words, that gives the government much more flexibility. If it has a new issue and has to create a ministry, it doesn't have to create and replicate a whole ministry. The cost to government is much more efficient. The government can be served in a much more integrated way.

Mr Dunlop: Thanks very much, Mr Daniels.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair: No. At this time, if you want to continue, you already have nine minutes of your time taken off, so 11 minutes left.

Mr Dunlop: OK. Mr Daniels will be here for the rest of the day, so we can ask questions after.

The Vice-Chair: That's fine.

Mr Peters: I want to thank Mr Daniels for the presentation. I think that presentation should be made to every constituency office to make sure that in a non-partisan way all our staff are fully aware of all the services. I would encourage you to do that, because I thought it was very good. Thank you.

Out of this presentation, I'd like to know how many kiosks exist in the riding of Elgin-Middlesex-London. If the answer is not available today, you can find out and get back to me.

Mr O'Toole: Each constituency office should have one.

Mr Peters: That's a good point in itself. Maybe each constituency office should. But I'd like to know how many kiosks exist in the riding of Elgin-Middlesex-London.

The Vice-Chair: I hope no one asks me about points of order after this. I allowed this to go. I'm not quite sure about the relevance to the Premier's office—

Mr Peters: I'm coming back to the Premier's office—

The Vice-Chair: Because you're asking all that, I don't want any more points of order making reference to what is happening now. Go ahead.

1630

Mr Peters: Thank you. Also, in the presentation that was just made, it was pointed out that we have 5,000 inspectors in Ontario covering a wide range of services. I would like to know how many of those 5,000 inspectors are full-time equivalents, how many are contract employees, and what the comparable numbers would have been in 1994 for full-time equivalents and contract employees.

Interjection.

Mr Peters: I'm not pushing it; he brought it up in the presentation, so don't be calling a point of order.

The Vice-Chair: Let's have the discussion through the Chair.

Mr Peters: If you can't answer that right now, I can wait.

Mr Mazzilli: On a point of order.

The Vice-Chair: That's not a point of order. I'm going to shut this part down, about this dialogue.

Mr Peters: He said there were 5,000 inspectors in the province in his presentation. I want to know about those 5,000 inspectors.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Peters, could I ask you to repeat that? I have a response back for you.

Mr Peters: In the presentation that was just made to us, the figure of 5,000 inspectors was used. I would like to know, in 2002, how many of those inspectors are full-time equivalents and how many are contract employees? I would like to know what the comparable numbers were in 1994 for full-time equivalents and contract employees.

I want to commend the powers of observation of the Premier's office staff who were here and saw me using the government—I'm assuming this is an internal phone directory. I'd be happy to circulate it to the members. I'm assuming they raced out and grabbed an up-to-date one, because the one I'm using is dated September 17.

In a previous meeting, we were told there were 44 people working in the Premier's office. I don't know what this directory looks like today, but if I add up everybody who's in the Premier's office—and I'm not adding in the Premier's security; I'm not even going to put on the record how many are in the Premier's security

office, respecting the security of that, and I'm not counting the staff of the two parliamentary assistants. I was told there are 44 staff who work in the Premier's office. On September 17 there are 51 listed. Then you go into the Cabinet Office and you go to the Premier's communications support and the Premier's correspondence unit and there are another 35 individuals named there listed under Premier's office.

I come back to the question I asked previously. If we're trying to compare apples to apples in terms of looking at the Premier's budget, some things are in the Premier's office and some are in the Cabinet Office, but they're all there to support the Premier. You told me 44 people work in the Premier's office. On September 17, these people in team development, which you said has since been disbanded, were listed. I was wondering if you could table a current, up-to-date copy of this phone directory, and could you explain to me why there is a discrepancy in the number of employees?

Mr Dunlop: Thank you very much for the question, Mr Peters. There were 44 as of last week, and I stand by that. I'm going to ask Mr Dean, the deputy minister, to comment on the Premier's correspondence unit.

Mr Peters: No. I'm more interested in the discrepancy between the 51 I total in this phone list here of Office of the Premier compared to the number of 44 that you presented to me.

Mr Dunlop: And that's what we're going to try to answer.

Mr Tony Dean: We'll start with the September 17 list. We thank you for circulating that; it's very helpful. It probably would be helpful for you to know that as well as excluding the offices of the parliamentary assistants from this list you've mentioned, the people in the team development group have moved out. The public appointments unit, which I think is on your list—

Mr Peters: Correct.

Mr Dean: —is actually a part of Management Board. The Premier's correspondence function is part of Cabinet Office, as we mentioned earlier. There is a constituency office on this list that wouldn't be part of the Premier's office. There's a public inquiries function; that would be part of Cabinet Office. You have mentioned already the Premier's security, and I'd add to that the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, which is listed—

Mr Peters: I didn't count those. Then you're at your 44, because if you subtract two for people in development, two for public appointments and three for public inquiries, you're at 44.

Mr Dean: OK. I'm pleased about that.

Mr Peters: Well, if you're telling me there are more—maybe there are more people not working there?

Mr Dean: As to the second part, the functions carried out by Cabinet Office—you specifically asked about the Premier's correspondence unit. That is part of the civil service and part of Cabinet Office in the same way that correspondence units are in other ministries. It has been this way in Cabinet Office, we believe, for close to 20

years. This is a long-standing separation. It is a communications function.

Again, just to point out—for me personally it's quite important that this distinction is made: on the civil service side or the public service side within Cabinet Office of course we are responsible for the due diligence, for ensuring that ministries and indeed the Premier's office adhere to government guidelines and requirements. We are charged with communicating with all ministries through the public service side to ensure that we are translating down to ministries both in a communications sense and a policy sense and actually also a fiscal sense the priorities of the Premier and his staff, but we're also translating up those interests and priorities of ministers and their deputy ministers.

Specifically, I can say that Cabinet Office does provide support on correspondence. It provides impartial advice on policy matters, issues monitoring, and on communications. This is an area which, as you all know as elected officials, is becoming tougher and more complex as each year, if not each week, passes, the whole issue of communications and issues management. There, given the growing transparency of government and interest in government operations from both the media and other institutions, the communications staff in cabinet office work to ensure that ministries are again adhering to public policy and public service guidelines in terms of the impartiality of advertising and things of that nature and, if you like, managing the business of government from an administration and public service perspective.

To contrast that with what those similar functions would do in the Premier's office from a policy, fiscal and communications perspective, the Premier's office staff are obviously very much, as the name implies, interested in the political, keeping caucus informed, ensuring that the government stays on track in terms of meeting priority commitments. As they work with ministries and move across government and down government, their primary point of contact is with ministers' offices. So very similar functions—certainly we do have two groups of communications professionals—but doing quite different things day in and day out, but of course we're working very closely together in an ongoing sense.

This is important, because as Art mentioned just a short while ago in terms of connectedness and lining up the functions of government, we have moved in the space of the last several years from a situation in government where we were not only disconnected organizationally but where policy, communications and fiscal considerations were actually considered quite separately and at different points in time. One of the additional ways in which we've tried to show leadership, and I think are being emulated elsewhere, is in the effort that has been placed in the Ontario government toward ensuring that when a policy initiative comes forward, the fiscal due diligence, fiscal considerations and communications issues are moving parallel through the system. This has meant that a whole lot of work has to be done by ministries both on the political and civil service sides, but

if I can put it this way, I think it's one of the huge breakthroughs we've made internally in terms of more effective government. You've seen the external side of it in terms of the presentation Art made.

Mr Peters: Would it be possible to have tabled an up-to-date list of the Cabinet Office and the Premier's office staff? It's actually quite handy, because a lot of these names and phone numbers don't exist in the 2002 phone book and it's nice to be able to pick up a phone and make some direct calls. Would it be possible to have this tabled?

1640

Mr Dean: We'll endeavour to provide that, yes.

Mr Peters: Thank you.

Mr Dunlop, in previous discussions here I left a number of questions with you. At the last meeting you said you had some answers for me. I'm just wondering if maybe you want to go through some of those areas where you have some responses, and we can take it from there.

Mr Dunlop: OK, that's good. First the comparison of salary allocations: that was something you brought up on the first day and I wanted to respond to that. By the way, I have your pins for you too. I wanted to make sure you have your province of Ontario pins today.

First of all, you asked why the Office of the Premier salaries increased by \$600,000 from 2000-01 to the present day. My response is that the Premier's office salary and wages allocation did not increase by \$600,000. You were comparing past expenditures to current estimates in the estimates book. Through prudent management of resources, our actual expenditures generally come in below the allocation. For this year, 2002-03, we have taken a voluntary 5% reduction in the Premier's office budget estimates. That's something Premier Eves wanted to see occur, and of course the staff have come through with that. That's why it's in the estimates book today.

Another question that came up was on—

Mr Peters: Just before you go on, I want to make sure I have it on the record that the pins weren't for me; they were for a pin collector.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Peters, I have a pin for everybody on the committee. If you need a few extra, I'll be happy to get some for your constituents as well. I don't know how many people realize that Ontario's Promise is a very successful program in our province.

Mr Peters: Yes. I'd prefer to hear about the Premier's office right now, though.

Mr Dunlop: You didn't want to hear more about Ontario's Promise?

Mr Peters: Not right now, thank you. I'd like you to deal with some of the outstanding questions.

Mr Dunlop: OK. I guess we can go into that a little more later on.

Mr Peters: Unless you've got the answer of how much the former Premier's office is costing and staff associated with the Ontario's Promise project.

Mr Dunlop: That's something we'll try to obtain.

Mr Peters: I think that was on a previous question.

Mr Dunlop: Another question from Mr Peters was on the Premier's travel allocation. You asked me why the estimate of the Premier's travel is only \$112,400 when the Premier travels across Canada and internationally. As was noted, in accordance with the practice of previous Premiers, some of the Premier's travel expenses are covered by the ministry to which the initiative relates, and of course that's reported in all of our public accounts.

For example, when the Premier travels to a first ministers' conference, those costs are covered by the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. Obviously, there is a number of first ministers' conferences over the course of the year. We will get into intergovernmental affairs a little later on, when we start into that on Wednesday afternoon.

In fact, having the Premier serve in a dual capacity of both Premier of Ontario and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs actually reduces these costs, so there are some savings to that. Premier Eves has gone back to what some of the other Premiers had done previously, being Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs as well as the Premier.

Variances in the staff lists was a question you asked about. I'd like to take this opportunity to respond to that question about the variances in the Premier's office staff lists as they appear in the directory. We've gone over that somewhat here today. They're quite simple. The information that appears in the government telephone directory is compiled from data collected each fall and the telephone directory is then printed in the fall of each year. Certainly there are many changes from December or November of the fall season to a year later. Therefore, the 2002 telephone directory, which was printed in the fall of 2001, reflects the staffing and the departments of each ministry as of October 2001. Of course that's now almost 13 months old.

Obviously, since October 2001 a number of organizational changes have taken place. Some of the Premier's office staffing and departments have changed since the 2002 phone book was published, and of course we've seen there have been many changes even since September 17. I stated previously that at the present time the Office of the Premier has six departments. They are—again I'll repeat it—the chief of staff, policy, issues management, communications, tour and public events, and special projects.

Advertising expenditures: you also asked me about the Premier's office expenditures for advertising. That came up last week. I'd like to advise the committee, and through the chairman to Mr Peters, that the Premier's office does not use its budget allocation for government advertising. Ministries are responsible for the purchasing of ad space or any air time.

Mr Peters: Can I ask a question on that? I was watching this morning on CFTO, Canada AM, and there was an advertisement on the television sponsored by the Premiers of Canada—

Mr Mazzilli: The Premiers of Canada?

Mr Peters: The Premiers of Canada—

Mr O'Toole: About Kyoto.

Mr Peters: No, it wasn't about Kyoto; it was about health care.

Mr Dunlop: It's on the Premiers' Council of Canada.

Mr Peters: OK, you just told me that the Premier's office doesn't advertise, but this said it's sponsored by the Premiers, so who paid for that ad that I saw on television this morning?

Mr Dunlop: That's a question I would actually like, if we could, to leave until intergovernmental affairs, because we'd like to do quite a bit of discussion on health care and the cost allocation to those—

Mr Peters: I'm talking about the cost allocation of that ad that I saw on television this morning. It said it was sponsored by the Premiers of Canada, so who paid for that? Who paid Ontario's one-eleventh share?

Mr Dunlop: My understanding right now is that money came out of the Ministry of Health in each territory and province. It came out of their health allocation. But, if I may, Mr Peters, I think we'll—

Mr Peters: If you can find out, because that ad aired at about 10 to 8 this morning.

Mr Chudleigh: It's been on for a couple of weeks.

Mr Peters: I don't have cable at home.

Interjections.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Peters, I just want to point out to you that is something that we'll deal with a lot under intergovernmental affairs and health care. We'd like to deal with—

Mr Mazzilli: What's the purpose of that ad?

Mr Peters: He just said we're going to deal with it under intergovernmental affairs.

Mr Dunlop: If we may. It's interesting. It's on the federal shortfall of health care funding in Canada. We would like to—

Mr Peters: Mr Chairman, if you don't mind, the member said we're going to deal with it in intergovernmental affairs, so I'll wait for the answer.

The Vice-Chair: Mr Mazzilli, would you mind giving Mr Peters his chance to ask his question?

Mr Dunlop: We'll deal with it under intergovernmental affairs.

The Vice-Chair: You'd better wrap up now.

Mr Dunlop: I'm not going to have time to wrap up all the answers—

Mr Peters: On my next round I'll have to wait for some of those answers and, if not, they could be tabled with the committee. My main interest is an up-to-date copy of these full lists.

Mr Dunlop: We'll see what we can provide you with.

Mr O'Toole: Mr Chair, I seek unanimous consent—they've gone to a lot of work here—that they be allowed to put the information on the record that Mr Dunlop has—

Mr Peters: My time's up, though.

Mr O'Toole: Yes, but I think they're all questions that have been raised. Unanimous consent?

The Vice-Chair: Put what on the table? I don't know what.

Mr O'Toole: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair: What?

Mr O'Toole: Well, he's giving a great deal—

Mr Peters: So what are we going to do, Mr Chairman? Are we doing the same thing? The time comes off, like yours?

The Vice-Chair: Order. What is it you're putting on the table? I don't know what the request is.

Mr Dunlop: I've got a couple of responses yet to some of the questions Mr Peters asked last week. I told him I would try to get those responses.

Mr Peters: I'll wait until my next turn.

The Vice-Chair: It's Mr Bisson's time now for 20 minutes—

Mr Dunlop: OK, we'll get back to your questions after, in the next round.

The Vice-Chair:—and you can always just present it anyhow.

Mr Bisson: OK, there were a number of questions that I had asked a couple of weeks ago—

Mr Chudleigh: How'd the speech go?

Mr Bisson: It was quite good; it was about five minutes. It was all right.

Interjection: You needed a videoconference.

Mr Bisson: Yes. Was it closed-captioned? Did you get to see it?

Mr Chudleigh: I can't read it from here, though.

Mr Bisson: OK. There were a couple of questions I had asked you last week. You came back and responded on one of them for CN. There were a few others. You were supposed to give me a written response and I haven't got that yet. I wonder if you can get that?

Mr Dunlop: I still haven't got the written response for you, Mr Bisson.

Mr Bisson: You don't? Can we get that tomorrow?

Mr Dunlop: We'll do what we can, OK?

Mr Bisson: All right, that would be a good thing.

Just to come back a little bit to what I was asking a little while ago, I guess what I'm wondering is, who coordinates the lobbying that goes on inside the Premier's office? We know that according to government legislation that was passed under the Harris government, there is lobbyist registration legislation that's in place. I think that's a good thing. I don't argue that it's a bad thing. I'm just wondering, how do you ensure that people who are coming in to lobby are indeed subject to that legislation and, if they are, are they double-checked against the lobbyist registry? That would be my first question.

Mr Dunlop: Thank you very much for the question. I'm going to have to ask Tony if he can possibly respond, but I don't have that.

Mr Dean: Right now, I'm unable to, but I'll get an answer for you as quickly as I can.

Mr Bisson: Could you? Basically what I want to know specifically is what the process is because, obviously, if I lobby more than 10% of the time, I think the legislation says you're considered a lobbyist. I just want to know, how do you ensure that in fact this person is supposing to be a registered lobbyist, and if so, and if

they should be under the legislation, how do you go back and double-check that they've actually been registered?

1650

Mr Dunlop: We can get back to you

Mr Bisson: Are you going to get back to me? That's fine, I accept that as an answer. I don't expect to have everything answered immediately. Well, I'll need an answer before I get to all the other ones; that's the wonderful thing about that question.

To get back to the issue I was asking you around the CN question, there's a fair amount of concern in conversations that I've had with community leaders—nice plaque, thank you. I think I've just been given an award.

Interjection: Not even close.

Mr Bisson: It looks like I got it. Thank you very much.

There's quite a bit of discussion amongst community leaders in northeastern Ontario and as well people who are out there chatting it up in regard to what's happening with the Ontario Northland, that in fact there is going to be some kind of assurance, that in these negotiations that your government has undertaken with CN for the eventual sale of Ontario Northland, there are certain premises to the negotiations that basically try to ensure that certain points are met, that certain objectives are met in negotiation; and I'd asked you the other day in regard to services being provided vis-à-vis rail passenger service up along Highway 11 from Toronto all the way up to Cochrane.

In your answer you had said that the Premier's office was interested in making sure that the negotiations had as a starting line that no erosion of services would happen as of this point—from the point of sale or transfer, or whatever it is that you decide to do. Is it the plan of the Premier's office to make sure that there is something written down, in the contract of sale that obliges the new owner, should it be sold, that there would be a certain benchmark when it comes to level of service that needs to be provided, or is that just left up to the new owners if you do sell it?

Mr Dunlop: I think I tried to make it as clear as possible that some of the most important commitments in the request for the proposal, of course, were job protection, the economic development of the north and service improvement. That, I believe, is part of the request for the proposal that they would work on right today.

I don't think there's a member we don't hear from in the north, or any part of the province, who doesn't feel that the economic development of their community, and a strong voice for job creation—we as government and government members in particular—the one thing we're probably more proud of than anything else is the number of jobs that we've actually seen created right here in Ontario. That is why we're so excited. Just a week ago when the September job creation numbers came out from across Canada, we saw that 80% of the new jobs created in our country in the month of September were created right here in Ontario, with 32,000 new jobs.

Minister Ecker is keeping her fingers crossed—as we all are. We want to see the job creation numbers for October come out and we want to see that number one million up there as the figure for job creation since we've come to power in 1995.

Certainly, the request for the proposal, meaning strong economic development, job creation and service improvement—we know how important it is for you and that's what we believe will be the end result for the CN and Ontario Northland.

Mr Bisson: I guess the difficulty I'm having, with all respect, is that we've seen a decrease in population in northern Ontario by almost 10% since you've come to office. So I have a bit of a hard time accepting that things are better economically in northern Ontario than they were seven years ago. But that's not my question.

I disagree. I don't think that you should sell off Ontario Northland; I think it's a mistake. Certainly when we got rid of norOntair, which was the air wing of the ONTC, we were promised that in the transfer of services to the private sector, the east-west links that were established by norOntair would be protected by the new carriers coming in, and now we're at the point where they're not. You're paying exorbitant amounts of money for whatever connections exist, and a whole bunch of connections that used to exist are non-existent: You can't fly out of Kirkland Lake, you can't fly out of Earlton; you can't fly out of Hearst, and the list goes on. Those communities are basically stranded. It's either the highway or the highway; that's basically the choice. One of the only other connections of transportation they have is rail service.

My question to you is, if you're going to undertake privatization, which I don't agree with, but if you are going to undertake it, is the government intending to put in the negotiations and eventually into the contract of sale some sort of mechanism that gives an assurance to northerners that a certain level of service will be demanded by the new owners, at least at the very beginning, and what their plan is over the longer term? Or do you just leave it to the whim of the private sector?

Mr Dunlop: Mr Bisson, I have to tell you right up front that I don't have all the details of the RFP that CN will work with under the Ontario Northland rail system. I understand the importance of transportation in the north. I know, as a member of the Premier's task force on rural Ontario—I think Mr O'Toole sat in on some of the meetings—we visited the north. We visited your community of Timmins and Kenora, and I believe Rainy River. We visited a number of communities and we heard over and over again how important not only rail service and good highways are, but air service as well. That's certainly an issue that all communities in the north are concerned about.

I have to tell you, though, that the two numbers that come to my mind immediately since 1995 are the amount of money we have spent in the north on new road construction projects—I think the total now, since 1995, is about \$6.5 billion that has been spent right across our

province on Ministry of Transportation road construction. Since 1995, on Highway 11 between Orillia and North Bay—and I'm sure Mr Miller must be really happy when he hears these numbers, because most of that's through his riding and not mine—there has been over \$300 million spent on that particular stretch of highway. Also, on Highway 400 between Port Severn and Sudbury, another area where Mr Miller has a number of kilometres of road, \$342 million has been spent on that particular stretch of highway.

So our government believes very strongly in a strong transportation system, and we would hope the same thing would be built into the Ontario Northland as well.

Mr Bisson: Every government—mine, yours and those before us—spent money on highway construction. If I remember the figures correctly, I think our budget on capital for MTO for each of the years we were in government was \$1.8 billion. So I can sit here and say, "We spent more than you," but what's the point? All I'm asking is this. Your government is undertaking the privatization of what is, for northeastern Ontario, one of the important rail links, one of the important links of communication and transportation that we have. In many cases it's the only game in town. In many of the communities, like Hearst and others, there is no way to get out of town other than the highway because they don't have air service. For a lot of the manufacturers in the woodlands industry or the mining industry or others, it's basically the cheapest way to get their product to market.

What I am concerned about is that if you are going to undertake a privatization, the Premier's office—I know he is very involved in this; he has made it known, and to his credit. I'm not complaining against this point. He has made a point of saying there will be no job losses in the transfer to CN. All I'm saying is that if you're prepared to do that as a government and the Premier is prepared to intervene at that step, I think there have to be certain benchmarks put in the CN contracts if they do sell it. Again, I want to say I don't agree; we shouldn't sell it. But if you do, it seems to me we have to hold CN's feet to the fire and there have to be certain requirements on the sale that certain services stay in place. All I'm asking you is, is the Premier giving direction that there is a basic level of service that would be no worse than it is now and that would be maintained by CN, should the CN sale happen?

Mr Dunlop: We have a commitment to that, and as I said earlier, the job protection is very important.

Mr Bisson: OK. So you're saying that indeed it is one of the requirements that the Premier's office is going to make sure that happens. That's all I'm asking.

Mr Dunlop: Job protection, economic development—

Mr Bisson: And a base level of service.

Mr Dunlop: —and service improvement is what the plans were for the RFP.

Mr Bisson: Now let me bring in the other parts. I accept that at face value. Again, I want to say that I don't agree you should sell this, but you're saying that if it is sold, the government is going to make sure in negotiation

that we are no further back in services than we are now. Correct?

Mr Dunlop: That's true, and that will continually be part of the discussions with CN.

Mr Bisson: OK. I take that at face value.

The second part of this is how it impacts First Nations communities. As you well know, for the communities of James Bay, it is the only show in town. There are no roads. The only way you can transport goods into James Bay at any kind of rate that makes sense when it comes to transportation is by rail. So one of the most important links for the James Bay coast is Ontario Northland. As I said, your government has decided that they want to sell it off to CN. I disagree; I don't think we should be doing that.

1700

I think one of the difficulties we have, and this is just my philosophical belief, is that we have no difficulty, as a concept of public policy, in supporting roads—rightfully so. You said correctly that Mr Miller has had a pile of money spent in his riding to build up our system of public highways. Great announcement. Good work. I have no argument with you. But we seem to have a difficulty when it comes to spending money on rail infrastructure. I fail to see, quite frankly, what the difference is from a public policy perspective, why we're not prepared to support rail infrastructure. The two, to my way of thinking, are somewhat related.

What I want to get from you is some sort of assurance about the very special role the ONTC plays for the James Bay communities of Moosonee and all those further north, that there is going to be some sort of mechanism in negotiations which ensures that those communities on James Bay that rely on rail passenger service and rail freight service are not going to be negatively affected. So for the Polar Bear Express run from Cochrane to Moosonee, are there any kinds of conditions being given to the negotiations to ensure that we're protecting rates, that we're trying to make sure we're no worse off when it comes to services that are provided on the James Bay coast?

Mr Dunlop: My understanding of the government is that we plan on utilizing the expertise of CN. As far as I am concerned, as I said earlier, job protection, more economic development in the north and service improvement—I think those are priorities of not only the Premier but of Mr Wilson, the Minister of Northern Development and Mines, as well.

I know you agree with the private partner—

Mr Bisson: We don't agree.

Mr Dunlop: —and you've said that many times today. I understand that; I know where you're coming from. But we think that this is a win-win situation for all. With job creation and increased economic development in northern communities and service improvement to those communities, we think that can be a win-win situation for everyone.

Mr Bisson: But specifically to the line that has been Cochrane to Moosonee: as I said, and I'm not going to

repeat it because the point was made, to those communities, that's a lifeline. All I'm asking you is, in your negotiations with CN, are there going to be some assurances given in the sale, if it should happen, that services that are provided from Cochrane to Moosonee will at least be maintained at the current level of service and that the rates will not go up upon transfer of the rail services to CN?

Mr Dunlop: Mr Bisson, if in fact the deal closes with CN, any deal with CN will reflect our government's commitment to protect jobs and to improve service to those communities.

Mr Bisson: I'm still not comfortable with your answer. I just want to make sure, because there are a lot of people who are nervous about this. In speaking to the mayor of Moosonee, to a number of people who are basically involved in the business community and to a lot of the native leaders along the coast—they're worried about this. They're saying, "What kinds of assurances do we have in Moosonee, Moose Factory and other communities that we're not going to end up with worse service and higher prices?"

All I'm asking is a very simple question: is it the base part of your negotiations, the floor of the negotiations, that CN upon takeover will make sure that the clients are no worse off when it comes to price and service?

Mr Dunlop: Let's make it clear: no final decision has been made. That's the key thing. But at the conclusion of the negotiation period, the government will review the final agreement to ensure that it maximizes the service improvement objectives for the people of northeastern Ontario before granting any final approvals. So yes, it will be an improvement in service, job protection and economic development.

Mr Bisson: So you've answered that part of the question.

The only other comment I would make is this. I wonder about the political logic of the government's decision to do this in this time frame. You're going to be making a decision, smack in the middle of an election, about privatizing a service that goes across a number of northern ridings. I just say, boy, if you guys want to do that, you're welcome to it. You will pay the price for that come election time. If I can give you any kind of advance warning, it's that the timing on that could not be worse for you. I just thank you for the opportunity.

Mr Dunlop: Thank you for your advice on that particular issue. We appreciate that.

Mr Bisson: I can't understand the logic.

Moving over to the forestry industry: as you know, in northern Ontario there are a number of industries that are important, but forestry and mining—do I still have enough time?

The Vice-Chair: It's just that you've been so wide on everything. Where are you now: in the forestry industry?

Mr Bisson: Because we've expanded this to Cabinet Office. Basically, the Premier is the head of cabinet and he's the one who decides what the policies are, and I'm getting into a question of policy on forestry.

The Vice-Chair: You've got three minutes.

Mr Bisson: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: But we seem to be, on all of this, expansive of these issues.

Mr Bisson: Well, I'm just following the lead of the government. If they want to make cabinet presentations, that's fine by me.

Now, I think you'll agree with me that two of the key players in the economy of northern Ontario—and there are others; we understand there are many other industries that are important to us—are forestry and mining. I don't know if you're aware of the sustainable forestry development act and how it works, but it basically says the trees that are in our forest are crown trees and are there for public good. Companies have the right to cut those trees and process them by way of licence, through that legislation, but the bottom line is the trees that are cut are for the benefit of the community.

I just want to clarify something with you. Has there been any policy change from the Premier's office when it comes to the mechanism of how we interpret the sustainable forestry development act that allows how we treat the disposition of timber differently than before 1995?

Mr Dunlop: I listened to your question, and it's a Ministry of Natural Resources question. I simply don't have the answer to that right now.

Mr Bisson: The reason I raise it is because there has been an issue going on for some time that I've been checking into, and I'm being told that there's some discussion at the Premier's level on this issue. That's why I'm relating it back to these estimates, because it's the forum I have to do that. Specifically, what I need you to look into, if you could do that and get back to me tomorrow, is a very simple question: has there been a decision on the part of the Premier to change the way we do the disposition under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act?

Mr Dunlop: We'll see if we can obtain that information for you for tomorrow.

Mr Bisson: I take it that's all the time I've got left?

The Vice-Chair: You've got about a minute.

Mr Bisson: I'll give it to the Tories. A minute doesn't give me enough time to work up a sweat.

Mr O'Toole: We'll just deduct it from the time that was taken earlier.

Mr Chudleigh: You don't have another question, do you, John?

Mr O'Toole: I intend to share all my time with Mr Chudleigh, actually. I want to thank the previous presenters for celebrating excellence and accountability. That presentation was excellent, as we all said. From that, the only thing I could suggest is that each constituency office—Mr Chair, I don't think you're listening.

The Vice-Chair: I'm listening. I just want to make sure to tell you that you only have about nine minutes, so don't think you're going to do that for 20 minutes. You've already given up a considerable amount of time.

Mr O'Toole: I thought we were going to share that—

The Vice-Chair: You have nine minutes.

Mr O'Toole: We all benefited from that, so I want each party to reduce their time. I seek unanimous consent for that. It's only fair.

Mr Peters: I don't have a problem.

Mr O'Toole: See, this is quite open, Chair.

The Vice-Chair: I want to keep it in order. We've got nine minutes over here, which is reduced time. Will you continue?

Interjection.

Mr O'Toole: Thank you. Agreed.

Mr Peters: No.

The Vice-Chair: I didn't hear consent. Can we proceed?

Mr O'Toole: I'm sure that you, as the Chair, will be more than fair.

I want to—I'm not sure everybody's paying close attention. I thank Mr Daniels for the presentation. The only suggestion that came to me, and Mr Daniels and I have spoken about this before, is that constituency offices in 103 ridings in this province are already connected to Queen's Park, every one of them. I have constituents, small business and other people looking for birth certificates etc. What's the problem with us logging on? We do all this stupid paperwork anyway. We're secure. They should automatically become sites, starting tomorrow morning.

Mr Bisson: What are you saying, John, that we should be able to get into—

Mr Peters: Like kiosks.

Mr O'Toole: The kiosks that they explained in the e-government kind of model.

Mr Bisson: I thought you meant we could tap into the ORG database, and I was going, "Hell no."

Mr O'Toole: I mean that quite sincerely, the forms and the other things that are available. Those offices are already paid for by the taxpayers. That isn't a political process; it's convenience for constituents, regardless of stripe. That's what our offices do, all of us.

Mr Chudleigh: Are you finished?

1710

Mr O'Toole: No, I'm not finished. I do want to make sure that that is put on the record. I'm asking now for the second time. It's a public office; it is for the most convenience. If our constituents come in with a lost wallet, what's this sending them to the library all about, or some business kiosk? We're there, we're able. I want to do the job; we're being paid to do it. Instead we have to fax somebody or send something else to the—

Mr Dunlop: You may want to check, Mr O'Toole. That might add quite a workload to your—

Mr O'Toole: Good. We're there to do it. There are only 24 hours in the day. If it exceeds 24 hours we'll have to do it the next day.

Anyway, that's very important. We're adding a lot of these little business things that are just off on their own and are not connected.

Interjection.

Mr O'Toole: No. In fact, there are people there being paid that I'm not sure are doing anything.

I think the achievements of this government are sometimes understated. I want to put it on the record, if you have a list here of the achievements of our action plans, and give you a couple of minutes to respond to that. Well, you probably need an hour, because the achievements are endless.

The Vice-Chair: Just a moment. I give a lot of allowance for us to discuss a lot of things. But we're on the estimates specifically. I don't want to hear a wild thing about—I've heard from forestry to transportation, all that. What is it you're asking now that he can give a presentation on?

Mr O'Toole: Just a list of the achievements of the Eves government. This is the Premier's office, the Premier and leader of this province. In my view, the achievements—there probably isn't enough time in the rest of the estimates.

The Vice-Chair: Mr Dunlop, if you want to respond to what he asked with the Premier's office, you've got about four minutes to do that.

Mr Chudleigh: Garfield, I need two minutes.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Chair, have we got just four minutes left today for the government side?

The Vice-Chair: On the government side.

Mr Dunlop: Well, I don't have the time to cover the action plan in that. If I may, I'd like to make some comments on the kiosks, because that question came up a little earlier and Mr Daniels did present me with some information. There are currently 61 government kiosks in the province. That will go to 300 next year, so a total of 300 in the year—

Mr Bisson: Does that include the 103 for the constituency offices?

Mr Dunlop: No, that doesn't include anything for the constituency offices. I think that's something we should all talk very carefully about before we add kiosks in our constituency office. I think it's important to note, though, that what Mr Daniels was saying was that we've come a long way in the last few years with technology and making sure information is provided to the public, and it is expanding very rapidly. So 300 next year. I don't have any amount for your particular riding, Mr Peters.

Mr Chudleigh, I understand you have a question?

Mr Chudleigh: I just wanted to let you know that the Ontario licensing bureaus—I have three of their offices in my riding: one in Milton, one in Acton and one in Georgetown. These don't have kiosks. These are the old-fashioned way. You have the personal touch. These people talk to every constituent who comes in and renews a licence. I understand from Mr Daniels that the kiosks do a broader range of work and also renew licence plates.

I'd just like to point out that for the last eight years I've asked the Ministry of Transportation not to put any kiosks in my riding, because in Halton we like the personal touch. I'd like to reiterate that request, that if there are going to be 300 new kiosks going in, I'm sure there are lots of ridings that would like them; I would like none of them to be in my riding of Halton, thank you very much.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Chudleigh, I don't know if you have an Ontario government business centre or information centre in your riding?

Mr Chudleigh: There's one just south of me, yes.

Mr Dunlop: We have one in Simcoe county, located in the city of Barrie. I would highly recommend that any of the members of any of the parties take their constituency staff to those particular information centres. There's a wide variety of information, including some very valuable information that the federal government and the local municipalities also provide to those centres. I think they're important to the constituency staff so they can send folks to those. They'll do everything from birth certificates right through to—

Mr Chudleigh: My problem isn't with those other government services. My problem is, in terms of renewing and issuing licence plates and drivers' licences as done now by the private enterprise people who represent government services in those areas for MTO throughout Ontario and in three places in Halton is that they do an excellent job and I would not like to see that personal touch replaced by a machine. That personal touch is very important.

Mr Dunlop: Do your banks in Halton have any banking machines?

Mr Chudleigh: Yes, we've got banking machines. We also have live people where you can go to a teller and they give you money and things like that.

Mr Dunlop: I'm glad to know that. Thank you.

Mr O'Toole: It's old-fashioned, but it's—

Mr Dunlop: It's old-fashioned and service-oriented.

Mr Chudleigh: We're a very traditional community.

Mr Peters: I'll just continue. I think Mr Dunlop has some further answers to some of my questions, if you wouldn't mind, Mr Dunlop.

Mr Dunlop: We were dealing with some of the advertising expenditures at the Premier's office. I mentioned earlier that I would like to advise everyone in this room that the Premier's office does not use its budget allocation for government advertising. Ministers are responsible for the purchasing of ad space or air time. As I said earlier, the ads you see on TV with the Premier's Council of Canada we'll bring up next week in the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs estimates meeting.

The ministries themselves are also responsible for the planning and implementation of ad campaigns such as, for example, reforms to health care and education, free flu shots for all Ontarians, and promoting our province as a tourist destination. We've all seen all of these ads on TV and on radio and in newspapers as well.

Through the Cabinet Office, ministry communications branches receive support and direction on a wide range of communications activities, including news releases, public education and advertising.

The Ontario government has worked very hard to provide clear rules on how tax dollars can be used by government for advertising purposes. The Management Board Secretariat recently developed a new advertising content directive and guidelines that give taxpayers a

clear and open definition for paid advertising and sets the rules for government paid advertising as well. The content directive provides a clear distinction between legitimate government advertising and partisan or political advertising and brings existing advertising policies in line with the current best practices from other jurisdictions.

The Cabinet Office signs off on all ministry advertising, except for statutory advertising. This sign-off ensures that ministries are following the Management Board advertising directives and guidelines and promotes coordination among ministries to ensure that resources are used very wisely.

The final thing is that last week I was asked a question about the cost of signs. I still don't have that information. Those were the signs we talked about for the Ministry of Transportation about the construction projects across our province. I first thought they came from MTO, but in fact they are from SuperBuild, and I have not had an opportunity to provide you with that information yet.

Mr Peters: I had asked for further details about—you talked about the government jets, the fact that they were MNR jets. I was curious to know when the last time was that we purchased jets in the province and how much we paid. The other question was regarding the vehicles of the Premier's office: is the Premier's office setting an example of driving a made-in-Ontario vehicle? Again, you can do that without revealing the numbers, because I respect the security that goes with that office.

Mr Dunlop: Very simply, the government purchases vehicles that at least have parts made in our province and have manufacturing plants here in our province. We may buy a vehicle that's actually put together or produced in—let's say, for example, it's General Motors Yukon. Perhaps that vehicle—

Mr Peters: That truck frame was built in St Thomas, at the hydroforming plant that we beat Mr Chudleigh to.

Mr Dunlop: But it may very well be assembled in Detroit or in another state or another province.

Mr Peters: I'm still curious to know what percentage of our fleet, though—because I understand what you're saying, but you could say that with virtually any North American-made car; there's probably a component made at a plant somewhere in Ontario. But I'm curious to know about an Ontario-assembled vehicle. I use as an example the Crown Vic and the Grand Marquis built at the St Thomas assembly plant. I see that as a truly made-in-Ontario vehicle. Some of the plants in Oshawa—Mr O'Toole's riding: the Malibu. The Malibu is another police package vehicle we're seeing on the road right now. I'm curious to know: specifically a true made-in-Ontario vehicle and not so much the components.

1720

Mr Dunlop: The only one I know for sure is the Honda that Jim Wilson drives, because it's in his riding. He drives a Honda because it's manufactured there. But I'm not sure of the other vehicles. It's going to be really hard to pull those data together.

Mr Mazzilli: The police smash them up so they keep having to buy them all over again, which is really good for the economy.

Mr Peters: Yes. It sure is good for our economy, Frank.

Mr Dunlop: Particularly when we look at organizations like the Ontario Provincial Police, who order hundreds of vehicles a year because there's a constant trade-in—I'm very fortunate in my riding. I see a lot of these vehicles at the Ontario Provincial Police headquarters in Orillia. They have a huge, huge garage under the building and that's where all the decals are put on, the lights, and the decals are sent out—for example, a police car that's going to St Thomas actually has "St Thomas" on the side of it. They buy them probably a hundred at a time from different dealerships. They're sent there. They just simply get a white car and then the staff at the headquarters actually do all the work and send them out to the particular detachments they end up at.

Mr Peters: I'd still like to know the symbol that the Premier's office is, the example that he's setting as far as vehicles are concerned.

Mr Dunlop: I'll try to obtain that information.

Mr Peters: I still would like to know how much we spend on jets and how much—because there was a reference made in the last meeting to the federal government's foolish expenditure of \$100 million—

Mr Mazzilli: A lot less than Chrétien.

Mr Peters: Did you not just hear me? I just said "a foolish expenditure."

And I would like to know when the last time was that we purchased jets in Ontario.

Mr Dunlop: I think in fact Mr—

Mr Chudleigh: We bought them in 2000 and they were about \$10 million each.

Mr Peters: OK. I'd like that confirmed.

Interjection.

Mr Peters: Or turboprops—whatever they may be.

Mr Dunlop: But we don't have any of the new jets, or the new government planes.

Interjections.

Mr Peters: Mr Chairman, if we don't have a direct answer right now, I can wait. Do you have any more answers, anything else right now?

Mr Dunlop: That's all I had from the first day, but there are other questions.

The Vice-Chair: Could I at this time ask, when you made your presentation, opening comments, that you table it? I haven't received it yet—when you started, when you made your opening comments.

Mr Dunlop: That was our speech.

The Vice-Chair: Yes. I'd like to have it.

Mr Peters: And the next day you made another speech as well.

Mr Dunlop: OK.

The Vice-Chair: You promised that we would have it, and I haven't had it yet.

Mr Peters: How much time, Mr Chair?

The Vice-Chair: You've got lots of time: 13 minutes.

Mr Peters: I've got one question and then I'm going to exchange with the Chair to allow him an opportunity.

Mr Dunlop: Fine.

Mr Peters: Again today we saw an announcement made by the province about the introduction of the clean water act. I think one of the aspects you are really famous for as a government is these backdrops. I didn't see today's announcement but I'm assuming there was another backdrop behind the Premier that probably said "Clean Water."

Mr Chudleigh: No.

Mr Peters: There wasn't? OK. But I'd like to know about those backdrops. As an example, where do backdrops come in? Are they under advertising? Where would you find that line in a ministry's budget?

Mr Dunlop: We call those "wallpaper."

Mr Peters: Wallpaper?

Mr Dunlop: Wallpaper, yes.

Mr Peters: How much is that wallpaper a square yard?

Mr Dunlop: I have no idea, but it comes under the cost of each particular ministry. So I'm assuming, or I'm quite sure, that if there was wallpaper today, and I'm not sure if there even was, on any kind of announcement—I think you had a generic question for all the different ministries. There was none today but in fact it would come under the—

Mr Peters: I'd like to know what the annual wallpaper budget is at the province.

Mr Mazzilli: That's not a proper question.

Mr Peters: What do you mean, "It's not a proper question"?

Mr Mazzilli: You'd have to ask each ministry.

Mr Peters: But the Premier's office is responsible for each ministry. We talked a bit about advertising earlier, and he talked about each ministry being responsible, but the Premier is ultimately responsible. I'd like to know how much we spend globally in this province on advertising annually. I'd like to know what we spend in this province annually on wallpaper.

Mr Mazzilli: On a point of order, Mr Chair: We've had lots of leeway on both sides, but you can't call one ministry and get all the answers on all the ministries. Certainly the opposition had an opportunity to pick ministries, as we did. If you want to ask each individual ministry what their expenses are—

The Vice-Chair: It's not a point of order. I don't think that's a point of order for this one.

Mr Mazzilli: I think it is very much so.

The Vice-Chair: You may think so.

Mr Peters: On the same point of order, Mr Chairman: We've heard references made in a previous presentation to 5,000 inspectors across every ministry. So we've had the latitude of talking about ministries all across the board. The Premier represents the government. I'd like to know how much we spend on advertising and on this so-called wallpaper.

Mr Dunlop: To Mr Peters, before he takes his seat: certainly it's information on which I would have no idea

what the amount would be right now, but it's something that over time we can obtain. I don't think it's something I can get by tomorrow; I can guarantee you that.

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River): Mr Dunlop, does the Premier's office have only one parliamentary assistant?

Mr Dunlop: There are two of us.

Mr Bisson: Really? I thought there was only one.

Mr Curling: Mr Gill is the other one; is that it?

Mr Dunlop: We have both titles: parliamentary assistant to the Premier and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The Premier has both responsibilities and we, as parliamentary assistants, share responsibilities in both of those ministries.

Mr Bisson: You mean to say Mr Gill is coming to intergovernmental affairs?

Mr Dunlop: I think I'm doing the estimates.

Mr Curling: The Premier, as you know, has one of the most responsible jobs in the government. I see that we have the government's communications strategy and, in the other part of the overview statement, "to support and advise the Premier on issues facing cabinet and the government." There's a very important issue facing the government and cabinet today, and that is the issue of racial profiling. What advice are you getting from other ministries in regard to the fact of racial profiling?

Mr Dunlop: What information we are getting?

Mr Curling: Yes, because the overview statement here says, and let me read it, "The purpose of the Office of the Premier is to coordinate and support the activities of the Premier; the government's policy development and legislative agenda; the government's communications strategy; and to support and advise the Premier on issues facing cabinet and the government." One of the most important issues today is the fact that they're receiving some racial profiling. Chief Fantino has some taken some initiatives in order to address that, but I'm wondering now what initiatives the government has taken, or what advice he is getting from the other ministries, in order to have a good communications strategy in that regard.

Mr Dunlop: We treat that issue very, very seriously. Certainly the Premier has indicated that in the House as well. Right now, though, the lead on that is the Minister of Public Safety and Security, the Honourable Bob Runciman. He would be providing the Premier with advice and direction on that particular issue as we speak.

Mr Curling: So from what you're saying, and I don't want in any way to embarrass you, the communications strategy is being developed for the Premier. It has not yet been developed to say what kind of strategy or how he responds or how this government responds or how the other ministries respond to this. There is no statement yet in this regard?

Mr Dunlop: We have nothing to provide you with on that today. As I said earlier, it's simply that any information being provided to the Premier would come from the Minister of Public Safety and Security.

Mr Curling: I wonder if you would be able to obtain some sort of statement for me. Not to embarrass you in

any way or embarrass the Premier, but there is a need for some strategy to be put out immediately to address this concern. Mr Runciman, the minister, has been quite responsive in the House about what he will do about that, about the summit, with some indication that he's prepared to do whatever necessary. But I've yet to hear from the government what they intend to do. I'm sure the Premier has huddled together the respective ministers to address this concern. If there is no answer to that now, I understand. But I just wonder if there's a strategy coming forth to address that concern.

1730

Mr Dunlop: Again, I'm not aware of that strategy at this moment. But as the Premier and the Minister of Public Safety and Security have said, they're both very concerned about any of these allegations or concerns or issues, and they will be dealing with them. We'll look forward to whatever response they may have.

Mr Mazzilli: On a point of order, Mr Chair: Certainly we've heard of the summit. We've also heard that an inquiry is going to be called. I think it would be prudent not only for the Toronto police but also the government of Ontario to wait for the recommendations of that inquiry.

The Acting Chair (Mr Steve Peters): That's not a point of order, but thank you for your comments.

Mr Curling, please continue.

Mr Curling: Let me just elaborate on that, because I think Mr Mazzilli has missed my point completely. The fact is that I applaud Chief Fantino for making a move to investigate his forces by appointing Judge Charles Dubin. However, I'm saying too that the province awaits the strategy. I see that there are funds put aside in the Premier's budget in order to advise the Premier on issues facing cabinet, and I know this issue itself started some time ago and I have not heard anything from the government that I know they're preparing. I would say that they should start moving on this early or make some statements in the fall. Yes, the Honourable Lincoln Alexander has indicated a summit would be appropriate, but I think that some statement very soon on this would be helpful for the community at large.

Mr Dunlop: We certainly appreciate your comments, and I think you've made that very clear in the House, as have Minister Runciman and the Premier. Right now, I think everything is under advisement at the Premier's office. We'll listen to the Premier's response to this strategy. Again, we applaud Chief Fantino for the direction he's taking.

Mr Curling: My colleague Mr Peters spoke about an updated directory. I was completely impressed with the presentation here and how efficient it is. However, like Mr Peters, I am going to express some disappointment that even today, although we have this very sophisticated tool here—and I know they can do it in a hurry—this directory he presented is not up to date. I am going to express my disappointment that we don't really have an up-to-date directory of the Premier's office and the cabinet office. I hope we'll have that by tomorrow. I see

that with the electronic and technical equipment you have, at the touch of a button everything will be in place. Could I ask if we could have that by tomorrow?

Mr Dunlop: I can look into that. I can't guarantee anything. It's a very busy office.

Mr Curling: I know how busy they are, but this is estimates, where we should have the relevant information. Is it possible to have an update by tomorrow?

Mr Dunlop: I'd ask Mr Dean to help me respond to that. I'm not 100% sure.

Mr Dean: Let me put it this way: we'll endeavour to get as much information for you as we can by the end of the day tomorrow.

Mr Dunlop: We've tried to be as open as we possibly can on all these issues and to answer them to the best of our ability.

The Acting Chair: I think he was just looking for an up-to-date version of what—

Mr Dunlop: I have no idea what's out there right now. We will endeavour—

The Acting Chair: I'm sure you will.

Mr Bisson: Mr Parliamentary Assistant, can I get you to turn to page 7 of the estimates book? I'm sure this is just an accounting issue, and I just need you to explain it.

Mr Dunlop: Sorry, I had to get mine in bigger print.

Mr Bisson: Some of us have that affliction.

If you take a look at the right-hand column, the year 2001 actual, the Premier's salary was \$61,860 in addition to the basic salary he gets as an MPP. As you know, we all got a 3% increase based on the conflict of interest commissioner's recommendation that was adopted in legislation. I take it that 3% of \$61,860 brings it to \$63,715.

Mr Dunlop: I apologize for a moment here.

Mr Bisson: Page 7, the actuals of the Premier.

Mr Dean: I think the answer might be that the increase for the—

Mr Bisson: If you notice, they account for it all in 2001, which I thought was kind of odd. If you work it through, the Premier rightfully was at \$61,860, and he goes up by 3% in 2001-02 to \$63,715. So the vote for the increase would have been in the 2001-02 estimates, right? But if you look at the number in the 2001-02 estimates, there's an increase of \$3,766, which covers two years. I'm just wondering why they've done it that way. It should have been about an \$1,800-per-year increase on the estimates. I'm sure it's just an accounting thing. There's probably just something in the wrong column. In the end, he got the same amount of money, but I'm just wondering why you account for it that way.

Mr Dean: The change from 2001-02 to 2002-03 was actually an increase of \$4,445. That, as we understand it, represents a legislated increase of 6% in the Premier's, ministers' and PAs' salaries.

Mr Bisson: Yes, if you look at the bottom number. All I'm getting at is that it would stand to reason that in the 2001-02 estimates there would have been a request for an additional 3% for both the Premier's and the PAs' salaries, and that total should have equalled 3% in the

year 2001-02. Agreed? If you add up that number, that works out to 6% from 2000-01.

I'm just wondering why they account for it in only one budget year. Was it because they forgot to put the vote in for 2001, because the estimates were drawn up prior to the legislation taking effect? I'm just looking for an answer. He got the right amount of money. I'm just wondering why you account for it that way. Do you follow my drift? I can't remember the year we actually passed the act. When was the act passed for the 3% and 3%?

Mr Dunlop: I believe we just received our second increase.

Mr Bisson: That's right. We just got the second 3% increase. We got 3%, and the next year we got 3%. I'm just wondering why—

Mr Dunlop: So 2000 is when we would have received it.

Mr Bisson: Yes. I'm just wondering why it's all accounted for in last year's estimates. Is the answer because the increase was given after the estimates were drawn? Is that what happened?

Mr Dean: It may be, but I think we should confirm that for you.

Mr Bisson: Yes, just to check it out. No extra money was paid; I'm just wondering why you did it that way.

Mr Dean: Good question.

Mr Bisson: The other thing I want to get back to is the Premier's travel. I accept that the Premier of Ontario has to travel. I accept he's got to travel a lot, and I am not chintzy and saying the Premier should be travelling third class or limiting his travel. But I'm just a little curious, when I look at transportation for the Premier's office in the estimates—if I could get myself to the right page, I would find it very readily. I thought it was on the first page; I guess it's not. I believe the number was \$111,000 or \$112,000.

Mr Dunlop: It's \$112,000, on page 4.

Mr Bisson: Is that on page 4? Transportation, there we go. It says, "Transportation and communications, \$112,400" for the Office of the Premier. Is that all staff and the Premier? It can't be. That doesn't make any sense.

Mr Dunlop: That is primarily the staff.

Mr Bisson: OK.

Mr Dunlop: We mentioned earlier, maybe it was when Mr Prue was here, that if the Premier is travelling on behalf of a ministry, in a lot of cases that ministry or the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs would pick up that tab. As I said earlier today, when we get to the estimates for the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, we can talk a lot more about the Premier's travel etc. But certainly this is mainly staff.

Mr Bisson: I'm not berating the fact the Premier's got to travel, and it's probably a hell of a lot of money. But the point is, if we're accounting for it in this way in the Premier's estimates and we're saying his staff and he and some others at various ministries have travelled for \$112,000, it seems to me it's not a very transparent

process. I don't believe the Premier has anything to hide. He's an honourable man, and he travels on behalf of the province. I accept that. All I'm asking is, in the estimates of the Premier, why is it that we don't include all his travel, just so it's clear. I believe taxpayers want to know and have a right to know, and we should be upfront and clear on that.

1740

If we're reporting \$112,000 here, but we agree and we understand it's reported off in other ministries, is there any kind of estimate as to how much money the Office of the Premier charged for transport for him and his staff for last year? Is there any kind of accounting done?

Mr Dunlop: Certainly this was for the Premier's office and the staff, and I think it's consistent with what—

Interjections.

Mr Bisson: I take it they're watching Stockwell in the House.

Mr Dunlop: It's very consistent with what's happened with the previous Premiers from all political parties.

Mr Bisson: I don't argue that.

Mr Dunlop: So what you're actually saying here is, your suggestion is that whatever costs the Premier actually has in travelling, whether it's associated with the ministry of not, it should be put in a classification.

Mr Bisson: Just so we have clarity because, as you know, as members, all of our travel is posted. Anybody at the end of the year can pick up the book, look at me in the book and say, "You travelled and this is how much you spent, and you rate whatever when it comes to total expenditure." Fair enough. I have to defend that. In fact, I think I was, after leaders, the member who spent the most in travel, understandably. I live far from the riding and there's a lot of travel involved. I'm prepared to defend that.

The problem I have is the way we're accounting for it in these estimates of the Premier. It leaves a little bit to be desired. I don't argue that the Premier shouldn't travel, but it just seems to me it would be a lot clearer if we were to change the practice so that all of his travel is reported through the Premier's office and it's not off-booked to some other ministry. I'm just asking, is there any kind of discussion happening within the Premier's office to allow that change to happen?

Mr Dunlop: I'm certainly not aware of any change like that occurring, except that—

Mr Bisson: I see people laughing, so obviously they don't want to change it for some reason—or you're laughing at Stockwell on TV. I don't know which.

Interjection.

Mr Bisson: It's Stockwell? OK.

Mr Dunlop: With the policies that are in place today, we, as parliamentary assistants, if we're doing travel on behalf of our particular ministry, that will be picked up by the ministry as well, the same as the minister would have—you mentioned your travelling expenses, but if

you were a minister you would have your constituency expenses completely separate from that.

Laughter.

Mr Dunlop: They must be enjoying this more than—

The Premier of course has his constituency expenses as well. He has the Office of the Premier. I think it's very complex, and my only suggestion is that it's probably fairly fair the way it is right now.

Mr Bisson: But here's the problem. There's a bit of—I don't want to say a double standard, because that would be a little bit too strong. If I'm the Minister of Energy, then all of my expenses are reported under the Ministry of Energy and my travel and whatever other expenses I have as an MPP are covered under the Legislative Assembly Act and basically posted. As we know, every year there are expenses posted for the public to see.

The difficulty I have is that both the parliamentary assistants and the Premier have a bit of a different standard by which their travel is paid. So all I'm asking is that we would account for the Premier's travel in his estimates the same way that we would with any other ministry, and we don't off-book his travel to another ministry. I'm not going to argue that the Premier shouldn't travel. I think the Premier should be travelling a lot. He should be meeting with all kinds of people across the province, and I don't care if he comes back with \$500,000, but I want to know that it's reported so that there is a sense that we can compare apples to apples, basically how people are spending their money when it comes to travel.

I find this just a little bit, you know—\$112,000; what does it tell me? Well, it's whatever you've sloughed off into the Premier's office, and I'm sure Rae's office, and I'm sure Peterson before did the same thing. I'm just saying, from the point of perspective of the public and its being transparent, I think you have to agree it's not very transparent.

Mr Dunlop: I can appreciate your comments. However, this does clearly cover the cost of certainly all the staff in the Premier's office, the 44 people we talked about. That's very clear that it covers that.

Mr Bisson: Just to walk me through this: staff travel would be paid through this \$112,000, not through the other ministries.

Mr Dunlop: Yes.

Mr Bisson: And the parliamentary assistants' travel would be a combination of this and off-book to the ministries.

Mr Dunlop: Neither Mr Gill nor myself have done any work on behalf of other ministries, so any travelling expenses I would have with the Premier's office would be in here as well. I haven't had any expenses yet.

Mr Bisson: I just have a hard time trying to believe that a staff of 44 people would only charge up \$112,000 in travel. I know what it costs to travel back and forth to my constituency every year. The amount of money I would spend would probably be close to around \$40,000 or \$50,000 just for myself.

Mr Dunlop: I'd have to point out—

Laughter.

The Vice-Chair: Either we shut that thing off or—

Mr Bisson: Why don't you guys go to the House and watch it?

The Vice-Chair: Yes. Go to the House, or if you want to listen, don't disturb the estimates here, please.

Mr Bisson: I have a hard time accepting that \$112,000 is—what did you say, 44 or 54 staff people? I forget what you said.

Mr Dunlop: It's 44.

Mr Bisson: Forty-four staff people only charged up \$112,000, including the two PAs. To me, it doesn't make any sense.

Mr Dunlop: Most of the staff are at Queen's Park all the time.

Mr Bisson: I was in government and I know how it works. The Premier travels. He has staff people, and rightfully so, who must travel with him. I don't begrudge the fact that they're there; in fact, they need to be there. That's part of what he does. I don't know, \$112,000 just seems to me very low for travel.

This is a question to the Chair, and maybe Mr Peters raised this question before. Has there been a tabling of the expenses through this committee of all the staff who work in the Premier's office?

Mr Dunlop: That information hasn't been—

Mr Bisson: Hasn't been tabled?

Mr Dunlop: No.

Mr Bisson: I'm making a request. Again, this is not a witch hunt, but I have a hard time believing that it's only \$112,000. Am I in order, clerk, to ask that the Premier's office table the expenses of the 44 staff members? I know we've seen that before at the estimates of the Premier.

The Vice-Chair: It relates to the estimates of expenditures in here. If that's a request that you need, it can be presented. I don't see anything wrong with that because it's fully related to that.

Mr Peters: You'll have to submit an FOI, probably.

Mr Bisson: I'm just asking through you, Chair, if you can maybe confer with the clerk. I know that at previous estimates we've gone through, this kind of information was provided. I'm just not clear, because it was a while ago, if it was FOIed information or if it was information that was tabled through the committee. Am I within my right?

Mr Peters: Are you thinking of public accounts maybe?

Mr Bisson: No, no. It was at this committee.

The Vice-Chair: If I understand you correctly, the expenditures of staff within the Premier's office to be tabled here is a part of the estimates. What I will do then is, tomorrow, when we come back, I can tell you whether that is correct. Personally, I don't see anything wrong with that, but I will confirm that with you tomorrow.

Mr Bisson: Could you? Because the way we account for travel, I don't see it as being spot on. I don't argue that people of the Premier's office did anything wrong here; that's not my argument. But you're not going to make me believe that you only spent \$112,000 on travel. It doesn't add up.

Mr Mazzilli: Are we asking unanimous consent for all of the leaders of the parties to disclose their travel expenses?

The Vice-Chair: That's not what we're asking.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Chair, if I may, could I ask Mr Dean to help me respond to this?

The Vice-Chair: We have a bell going here.

Mr Mazzilli: I just want to understand the question.

The Vice-Chair: One of the things, too, let's face it, if you were all listening, you'd have heard it. We weren't listening to this. Mr Dean, could you—

Mr Dean: Just very quickly, it probably helps, again, if you look at the list of staff. You'll notice that the tour and public events group in the Premier's office is actually quite small.

Mr Bisson: What page is that? Oh, on the table.

Mr Dean: You'll see that there are in fact only two people whose work it is to advance the Premier's tour and to actually be on site with him, and possibly a third. So, for the most part, you only have two staff on the Premier's staff who are actually travelling on a fairly constant basis to advance and to support the Premier. That probably helps to put it in perspective.

The Vice-Chair: I have to adjourn now anyhow.

Mr Bisson: Can you get the answer for me?

The Vice-Chair: We stand adjourned, and tomorrow we'll give you a full explanation of that. We stand adjourned until 3:30 tomorrow.

The committee adjourned at 1749.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 29 October 2002

Office of the Premier	E-263
Mr Garfield Dunlop, parliamentary assistant to the Premier	
Mr Art Daniels, OPS Restructuring Secretariat, assistant deputy minister, quality service	
Mr Tony Dean, Deputy Minister and associate secretary of cabinet, policy	

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Chair / Président

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River L)

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James ND)

Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton PC)

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River L)

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park L)

Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe PC)

Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka PC)

Mr John O'Toole (Durham PC)

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London L)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr Trevor Day

Staff / Personnel

Ms Anne Marzalik,
Research and Information Services